

**REMARKS**

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As described in greater detail below, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 12-15 and 18-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,760,324 to Scott. To more clearly recite that which the Applicants regard as the invention, claims 1-20 have been canceled and new claims 21-34 have been added. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

As claimed, aspects of the invention relate to a VoIP system having a routing server that "selects the selected PSTN gateway from the plurality of PSTN gateways based on the workload status information and the specified routing plan, if predetermined for the VoIP client, else a default routing plan; and provides the VoIP client with a network address of the selected PSTN gateway for the VoIP client to connect to the selected PSTN gateway to exchange voice data therewith."

Scott does not teach or reasonably suggest these claimed aspects of the invention. In particular, Scott does not teach or suggest providing a VoIP client with a network address of a PSTN to establish connection therewith based, in part, on PSTN load. For example, Scott's routing -- discussed throughout Scott, but with particularity at column 16, lines 37-67 and column 78, line 11 to column 80, line 26 -- is not based on a combination of PSTN gateway workload and one of a predefined routing plan or a default routing plan. Rather, Scott's gateway server is directed to facilitating and coordinating interaction between PSTN gateway servers (column 4, lines 3-4) by routing calls across a network, such as to the final destination (column 8, lines 59-67 and column 16, lines 3-22). As such, Scott does not effectuate call connection by selecting a PSTN gateway and providing a corresponding network address to the VoIP client.

*Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 3, 9-11 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Scott in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,898 to Scott (referred to as "Scott(2)").

Claims 8 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Scott in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,867 to Ma.

As indicated, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested. In addition, neither Scott(2) nor Ma cure the deficiencies of Scott with respect to the currently claimed subject matter.

*Conclusion*

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned representative to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988, our Order No. INMEP0104US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By   
M. David Galin; Reg. No. 41,767

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
Telephone: (216) 621-1113  
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165

R:\DGalin\INME\P0104us\INMEP0104US.R01.wpd